UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,886	04/13/2004	David Michael Glenn	4829A(CIP)	4008
27887 FENNEMORE	7590 06/29/2009 CRAIG		EXAMINER	
_	CENTRAL AVENUE		ARNOLD, ERNST V	
PHOENIX, AZ	85012		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/29/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/822,886	GLENN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616		

	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MAMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	octed claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cied ciairris.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	-
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-11,46,47,50-54 and 66-73</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>12,14-22,59,60 ar</u>	<u>nd 63-65</u> .		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	thefere on an the date of filling a Nic		. h. a. a. a. a. a. a. a.
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Johann R. Richter/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616	6/28/09		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1) not all of the rejections have been overcome by the amendments; and 2) Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. While the new matter rejection over the film thickness ranges and 112 second paragraph rejections appear to be corrected by the amendment, the new matter rejection over "mixtures thereof" is maintained. Applicant argues that the plural of particle material (the particulate materials) indicates that the inventor was in possession of "mixtures thereof". The Examiner cannot agree. There are more than one particulate material recited, hence particulate materials, and combinations of those materials is not disclosed. Applicant's arguments concerning the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) are also not persuasive. Applicant has not demonstrated the criticality of having colored particles in the composition and the art teaches the equivalence of iron oxide and titanium oxide. Furthermore, Applicant states that "colored particles are pigments" and then states: "these references teach dyes, and they teach a variety of white pigments" (page 13 of Remarks). This is confusing because on the one hand it appears Applicant has argued that white is not a color (see Remarks filed on 12/12/08, page 16 where Applicant states: "Applicants respectfully request the Examiner concede that (t)itanium dioxide is white and that white is not "colored".") but on the other hand Applicant appears to be admitting the white is pigment and hence a color. These arguments are not persuasive, no unexpected data has been presented and the claims remain rejected.